UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/585,151	06/01/2000	Richard B. Himmelstein	HIM-PT002.2	5239

3624 7590 02/27/2006

VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C.
UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER	
NEURAUTER, GEORGE C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/585,151	HIMMELSTEIN, RICHARD B.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George C. Neurauter, Jr.	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-16,20 and 36-51* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-16,20 and 36-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 3-16, 20, and 36-51 are currently presented and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 14 November 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant continues to argue that the cited references do not disclose a type of search that matches information in a key phrase field and in each of a plurality of column headings and there is no hint or suggestion in Anand that would lead one skilled in the art to create a query that is a combination of a key phrase field and a column heading as recited in the present invention. The Examiner maintains the views as presented previously regarding these limitations.

The Applicant argues that the present invention use column names in the data table to define the query in connection with the key phrase field and do not provide any indication of where to look for the information. The claim specifically requires that the information in the key phrase field must match a column heading. As the "SQL The SELECT statement" shows, any column headings and its corresponding information that match the query or "key phrase" are returned.

Therefore, the claims are not in condition for allowance. The Applicant is also invited to consider the cited prior art in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1, 5, 7-12, 36-38, 40, 43, and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "HTML 4.0 Specification" ("HTML") in view of US Patent 5 974 416 A to Anand et al.

Regarding claim 1, "HTML" discloses a system for accessing and retrieving information on the Internet comprising:

a data table ("HTML table") stored on a user's computing device ("user agent") comprising:

a plurality of columns (Chapter 11, section 11.2.4 "Column groups: the COLGROUP and COL elements"), each of said columns having a heading ("header"; Chapter 11, section 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", paragraph beginning "Table cells may contain either header…" and section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements"); and

at least one row (Chapter 11, section 11.2.3 "Row Groups: the THEAD, TFOOT, and TBODY elements") having a plurality of cells corresponding to said plurality of columns, said row for storing information defined by said plurality of column headings (Chapter 11, section 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", paragraph beginning "Table cells may contain either header…" and section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements");

wherein each of said plurality of cells can be activated to perform at least one action related to said stored information within said cell. (Chapter 11, section 11.2.1 "The TABLE element", "onclick"; Chapter 18, section 18.2.3 "Intrinsic events", "onclick")

"HTML" does not disclose a key phrase field for defining a desired search and a search unit for accessing information stored on at least one database on the Internet that matches the information in said key phrase field and in each of said column headings, said search unit storing said accessed information in said data table, however, "HTML" does disclose wherein the column headings of a data table are used to correspond to cells (Chapter 11, section 11.4.2 "Categorizing cells")

Anand discloses a key phrase field for defining a desired search ("query" made through a "browser") and a search unit ("proxy") for accessing information stored on at least one database on the Internet that matches the information in said key phrase field and in each of said column headings (column 2, line 64-column 3, line 8; column 6, lines 26-28; column 11, lines 43-53), said search unit storing said accessed information in said data table (column 7, lines 59-62)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of these references since Anand discloses that the invention enables improved data transfer of data tables between a client and a database server on a network such as the Internet (column 2, lines 3-15). In view of this specific advantage and that both references as directed to transferring data table data between a

database and a client, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of these references and considered both references to be analogous to one another based on their related fields of endeavor.

Regarding claim 5, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 1.

"HTML" discloses whereby said stored information includes an e-mail address, and said at least one action comprises sending an e-mail to said e-mail address. (Chapter 2, section 2.1.1 "Introduction to URIs", "mailto")

Regarding claim 7, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 1.

"HTML" discloses the system further including a cursor and an activity menu having a plurality of activity buttons (Chapter 17, section 17.2.1 "Control types", "menus" and "buttons"); whereby each of said activity buttons defines an action related to said stored information within a cell. (Chapter 17, section 17.2.1 "Control types", "push buttons")

Regarding claim 8, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 7.

"HTML" discloses whereby said cursor highlights a cell (Chapter 11, section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements", "onfocus"; Chapter 18, section 18.2.3 "Intrinsic

events", "onfocus") and at least one of said plurality of action buttons change to reflect said stored information. (Chapter 17, section 17.5 "The BUTTON element", "onfocus"; Chapter 18, section 18.2.3 "Intrinsic events", "onfocus")

Regarding claim 9, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 1.

"HTML" discloses whereby each row includes a row heading. (Chapter 11, section 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", paragraph beginning "Table cells may contain either header…" and section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements")

Regarding claim 10, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 9.

"HTML" discloses whereby said row headings and said column headings are interchangeable. (Chapter 11, section 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", paragraph beginning "Table cells may contain either header…" and section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements")

Regarding claim 11, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 1.

"HTML" does not expressly disclose further including a centralized database for storing information, whereby said system accesses and retrieves information within said database,

however, Anand does disclose this limitations (column 2, lines 3-6)

Claim 11 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 1 also apply to claim 11.

Claim 49 is also rejected since claim 49 recites substantially the same limitations as recited in claim 11.

Regarding claim 12, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 11.

"HTML" does not disclose the system further including a website, for maintaining said centralized database, however, "HTML" does disclose the use of a web site or "machine hosting the resource" to store information (Chapter 2, section 2.2.1 "Introduction to URIs")

Anand discloses the above limitations (column 4, line 62-column 5, line 11, specifically column 4, lines 64-65 and column 5, lines 3-8).

Claim 12 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 1 also apply to claim 12.

Regarding claim 36, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 1.

"HTML" does not expressly disclose wherein each of said columns includes a user-definable heading, however, "HTML" does disclose wherein each column includes a defined heading (page 2,

section 11.1 "Introduction to tables", specifically the paragraph "Table calls may either contain...")

Anand suggests that a user may define a data table and its properties including a column that is received by the user, the received table further defines a stored data table (column 7, lines 59-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of these references since Anand discloses above that a user may define a data table however they may choose. In view of these suggestions and that both references are directed to user manipulation of data tables, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine these references and would have considered them to be analogous to one another based on their related fields of endeavor.

Regarding claim 37, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 1.

"HTML" does not expressly disclose wherein said at least one action includes accessing additional information based upon said stored information within said activated cell, the additional information also being stored in said data table, however, "HTML" does disclose wherein at least one action includes activating a cell, wherein information is being stored

in said data table (Chapter 11, section 11.2.1 "The TABLE element", "onclick"; Chapter 18, section 18.2.3 "Intrinsic events", "onclick").

Anand discloses accessing additional information based upon stored information within a cell, the additional information also being stored in said data table (column 2, line 64-column 3, line 8; column 6, lines 26-28; column 7, lines 59-62; column 11, lines 43-53).

Claim 37 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 1 also apply to claim 37.

Regarding claim 38, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 8.

"HTML" does not expressly disclose wherein said plurality of activity buttons includes a search button, whereby said key phrase field is replaced by said stored information in said highlighted cell and a further search is performed, however, "HTML" does disclose a plurality of activity buttons (Chapter 17, section 17.2.1 "Control types", "menus" and "buttons") containing stored information (Chapter 11, section 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", paragraph beginning "Table cells may contain either header…" and section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements") in a highlighted cell (Chapter 11, section

11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements", "onfocus"; Chapter 18, section 18.2.3 "Intrinsic events", "onfocus")

Anand discloses that a search is conducted based upon a user input ("query" from a "browser"), whereby said key phrase field is replaced by said stored information and a further search is performed. (column 2, line 64-column 3, line 8, specifically column 2, line 64-column 3, line 3; column 6, lines 26-28; column 7, lines 59-62; column 11, lines 43-53)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Anand to include a search button based upon the disclosures of "HTML" and Anand since Anand discloses that performing a search based on the contents of a data table initiated by a client enables further refinement of the data contained within the data table (column 2, lines 2-21; column 2, line 64-column 3, line 8) and that a user can initiate the query through the use of a web browser (column 5, lines 12-20). In view of these specific advantages and disclosures and that the references are directed towards transferring tabular data in an HTML format, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of these references and considered the references to be analogous to one another based on their related fields of endeavor.

Regarding claim 40, "HTML" discloses a system for accessing and retrieving information on the Internet comprising:

a data table ("HTML table") stored on a user's computing device ("user agent") comprising:

a plurality of columns (Chapter 11, section 11.2.4 "Column groups: the COLGROUP and COL elements"), each of said columns having a heading ("header"; Chapter 11, section 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", paragraph beginning "Table cells may contain either header…" and section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements"); and

at least one row (Chapter 11, section 11.2.3 "Row Groups: the THEAD, TFOOT, and TBODY elements") having a plurality of cells corresponding to said plurality of columns, said row for storing information defined by said plurality of column headings (Chapter 11, section 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", paragraph beginning "Table cells may contain either header…" and section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements");

action means associated with each of said plurality of cells, said action means performing at least one action based on said stored information in said cell. (Chapter 11, section 11.2.1 "The TABLE element", "onclick"; Chapter 18, section 18.2.3 "Intrinsic events", "onclick")

"HTML" does not disclose a key phrase field and a search unit as claimed, however, "HTML" does disclose wherein the column headings of a data table are used to correspond to cells (Chapter 11, section 11.4.2 "Categorizing cells")

Anand discloses a key phrase field for defining a desired search ("query" made through a "browser") and a search unit ("proxy") for accessing information on the Internet that matches the information in said key phrase field and in at least one of said column headings (column 2, line 64-column 3, line 8; column 6, lines 26-28; column 11, lines 43-53), said search unit storing said accessed information in said data table (column 7, lines 59-62), said search unit accessing additional information on the Internet until at least a portion of information matching said key phrase field and each of said column headings has been retrieved, whereby said search unit effectively performs multiple searches (column 2, line 64-column 3, line 8; column 6, lines 26-28; column 11, lines 43-53).

Claim 40 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 1 also apply to claim 40.

Claim 43 is also rejected since claim 40 recites a system that contains substantially the same limitations as recited in claim 5.

Regarding claim 44, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system according to claim 40.

"HTML" discloses wherein each of said columns includes a user-definable heading (Chapter 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", specifically "Table cells may...contain "header" information...The HTML 4.0 table model allows authors to label each cell...").

Regarding claim 46, "HTML" discloses a system for accessing and retrieving information on the Internet comprising:

a data table ("HTML table") stored on a user's computing device ("user agent") comprising:

a plurality of columns (Chapter 11, section 11.2.4 "Column groups: the COLGROUP and COL elements"), each of said columns having a heading ("header"; Chapter 11, section 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", paragraph beginning "Table cells may contain either header…" and section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements"); and

at least one row (Chapter 11, section 11.2.3 "Row Groups: the THEAD, TFOOT, and TBODY elements") having a plurality of cells corresponding to said plurality of columns, said row for storing information defined by said plurality of column headings (Chapter 11, section 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", paragraph

beginning "Table cells may contain either header…" and section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements");

wherein each of said plurality of cells can be activated to perform at least one action related to said stored information within said cell. (Chapter 11, section 11.2.1 "The TABLE element", "onclick"; Chapter 18, section 18.2.3 "Intrinsic events", "onclick")

"HTML" does not disclose a key phrase field for defining a desired search and a search unit for accessing information stored on at least one database on the Internet that matches the information in said key phrase field and in each of said column headings, said search unit storing said accessed information in said data table, however, "HTML" does disclose wherein the column headings of a data table are used to correspond to cells (Chapter 11, section 11.4.2 "Categorizing cells")

Anand discloses a key phrase field for defining a desired search ("query" made through a "browser") and a search unit ("proxy") for accessing information stored on at least one database on the Internet that matches the information in said key phrase field and in each of said column headings (column 2, line 64-column 3, line 8; column 6, lines 26-28; column 11, lines 43-53), said search unit storing said accessed information in said data table (column 7, lines 59-62), said accessed

information including a hierarchical structure of information, whereby additional information related to said accessed information is stored in said data table such that the additional information can be retrieved from said data table without performing an additional search (column 2, lines 3-21; column 7, lines 45-62; column 11, lines 54-64; column 12, lines 40-44).

Regarding claim 45, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 40.

"HTML" does not expressly disclose wherein each of said columns includes a user-definable heading, however, "HTML" does disclose wherein each column includes a defined heading (page 2, section 11.1 "Introduction to tables", specifically the paragraph "Table calls may either contain...")

Anand suggests that a user may define a data table and its properties including a column that is received by the user, the received table further defines a stored data table (column 7, lines 59-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of these references since Anand discloses above that a user may define a data table however they may choose. In view of these suggestions and that both references are directed to user

manipulation of data tables, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine these references and would have considered them to be analogous to one another based on their related fields of endeavor.

Claim 46 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 1 also apply to claim 46.

Regarding claim 47, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system according to claim 46.

"HTML" discloses wherein each of said plurality of cells includes accessing means, whereby if a cell contains additional information, said accessing means permits the user to access the additional information in said cell. (Chapter 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", specifically "The HTML table model allows authors to arrange data - text, preformatted text, images, links, forms, form field, other tables, etc. - into rows and columns of cells")

Regarding claim 48, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system according to claim 46.

"HTML" discloses wherein each of said plurality of cells includes action means, said action means performing at least one action based on said stored information in said cell. (Chapter 11, section 11.2.1 "The TABLE element", "onclick"; Chapter 18, section 18.2.3 "Intrinsic events", "onclick")

Regarding claim 50, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system according to claim 40.

"HTML" does not expressly disclose wherein the information accessed is partially located on the user's computing device and partially located on the Internet, said search unit supplementing the information located on the user's computing device with information located on the Internet, however, Anand does disclose these limitations (column 2, line 64-column 3, line 8; column 6, lines 26-28; column 11, lines 43-53).

Claim 50 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 40 also apply to claim 50.

4. Claims 3, 4, 39, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "HTML" and Anand et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of "Hyperactions in a Markup Language" ("Hyperactions").

Regarding claim 3, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 1.

"HTML" and Anand do not expressly disclose whereby said stored information includes a phone number, and said at least one action comprises connecting the system with said phone number, however, "Hyperactions" does disclose these limitations (paragraph beginning "Disclosed is a means of controlling…", lines 1-8)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of these references since "Hyperactions" discloses that the system allows the user to operate hardware using HTML (paragraph beginning "Disclosed is a means of controlling…", lines 4-8). In view of this specific advantage described above in "Hyperactions" and wherein each reference is directed towards using HTML documents and their associated elements to operate the system, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of these references and would have considered them to be analogous to one another based on their related fields of endeavor.

Regarding claim 4, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 1.

"HTML" and Anand do not expressly disclose whereby said stored information includes a facsimile number, and said at least one action comprises sending a facsimile to said facsimile number, however, "Hyperactions" does disclose these limitations (paragraph beginning "Disclosed is a means of controlling...", lines 1-8)

Claim 4 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 3 also apply to claim 4.

Regarding claim 39, "HTML" discloses a system for accessing and retrieving information on the Internet comprising:

a data table ("HTML table") stored on a user's computing device ("user agent") comprising:

a plurality of columns (Chapter 11, section 11.2.4 "Column groups: the COLGROUP and COL elements"), each of said columns having a heading ("header"; Chapter 11, section 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", paragraph beginning "Table cells may contain either header…" and section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements"); and

at least one row (Chapter 11, section 11.2.3 "Row Groups: the THEAD, TFOOT, and TBODY elements") having a plurality of cells corresponding to said plurality of columns, said row for storing information defined by said plurality of column headings (Chapter 11, section 11.1 "Introduction to Tables", paragraph beginning "Table cells may contain either header…" and section 11.2.6 "Table cells: The TH and TD elements"), the information consisting of an electronic mail address (Chapter 2, section 2.1.1 "Introduction to URIs", "mailto");

wherein each of said plurality of cells can be activated to perform at least one action related to said stored information within said cell (Chapter 11, section 11.2.1 "The TABLE element", "onclick"; Chapter 18, section 18.2.3 "Intrinsic

events", "onclick"), said at least one action consists of sending an electronic mail to the electronic mail address (Chapter 2, section 2.1.1 "Introduction to URIs", "mailto")

"HTML" does not disclose a key phrase field for defining a desired search and a search unit for accessing information stored on at least one database on the Internet that matches the information in said key phrase field and in each of said column headings, said search unit storing said accessed information in said data table, however, "HTML" does disclose wherein the column headings of a data table are used to correspond to cells (Chapter 11, section 11.4.2 "Categorizing cells")

Anand discloses a key phrase field for defining a desired search ("query" made through a "browser") and a search unit ("proxy") for accessing information stored on at least one database on the Internet that matches the information in said key phrase field and in each of said column headings (column 2, line 64-column 3, line 8; column 6, lines 26-28; column 11, lines 43-53), said search unit storing said accessed information in said data table (column 7, lines 59-62)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of these references since Anand discloses that the invention enables improved data transfer of data tables between a client

and a database server on a network such as the Internet (column 2, lines 3-15). In view of this specific advantage and that both references as directed to transferring data table data between a database and a client, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of these references and considered both references to be analogous to one another based on their related fields of endeavor.

"HTML" and Anand do not expressly disclose whereby said stored information consists of a phone number and a facsimile number, and said at least one action consists of connecting the system with said phone number and sending a facsimile to the facsimile number, however, "Hyperactions" does disclose these limitations (paragraph beginning "Disclosed is a means of controlling…", lines 1-8)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of these references since "Hyperactions" discloses that the system allows the user to operate hardware using HTML (paragraph beginning "Disclosed is a means of controlling…", lines 4-8). In view of this specific advantage described above in "Hyperactions" and wherein each reference is directed towards using HTML documents and their associated elements to operate the system, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to combine the teachings of these references and would have considered them to be analogous to one another based on their related fields of endeavor.

Claims 41 and 42 are also rejected since claims 41 and 42 recite a system that contains substantially the same limitations as recited in claims 3 and 4 respectively.

5. Claims 13-15 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "HTML" and Anand as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of "Distributed Databases" ("Distributed").

Regarding claim 13, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 12.

"HTML" and Anand do not disclose the system further including a plurality of databases, said plurality of databases being linked to said centralized database, whereby said system accesses and retrieves information within said plurality of databases.

"Distributed" does disclose these limitations (the sentence "A collection of several different...")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of these references since "Distributed" discloses that the plurality of database enables the client to obtain data from the

plurality of databases only from the centralized database (the sentence "A collection of several different..."). In view of these specific advantages and that both references are directed to database data retrieval, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine these references and would have considered them to be analogous to one another based on their related fields of endeavor.

Claim 51 is also rejected since claim 51 recites substantially the same limitations as recited in claim 13.

Regarding claim 14, "HTML", Anand, and "Distributed" disclose the system of claim 13.

"HTML" does not disclose the system further including an input unit, for inputting information into said centralized database, however, Anand does disclose an input unit for inputting information into said centralized database (column 3, lines 5-8)

Claim 14 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claims 1 and 13 also apply to claim 14.

Regarding claim 15, "HTML", Anand, and "Distributed" disclose the system of claim 14.

"HTML" does not disclose the system further including a verification unit, for verifying said input information,

however, Anand does disclose these limitations (column 6, lines 60-64; column 21, lines 17-52)

Claim 15 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claims 1 and 13 also apply to claim 15.

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "HTML", Anand, and "Distributed" as applied to claims 13-15 above, and further in view of "Module mod_log_common" ("mod_log_common").

Regarding claim 16, "HTML", Anand, and "Distributed" disclose the system of claim 15.

"HTML" and Anand do not disclose the system whereby said verification unit further includes tagging means, for tagging all input information with the date of entry, time of entry and origin of said input information, however, Anand does disclose a verification unit (column 6, lines 60-64; column 21, lines 17-52).

Claim 16 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claims 1 and 13 also apply to claim 16.

"mod_log_common" discloses a unit further includes tagging means, for tagging all input information with the date of entry, time of entry and origin of said input information (page 1, specifically "ident" and "date")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the verification unit to include the features disclosed in "mod_log_common" since "mod_log_common" discloses that the unit enables the logging of requests made to a server in a common format (page 1, the sentence "It provides for...")

In view of this specific advantage disclosed in "mod_log_common" and wherein the references are directed to requests made to a server by a client, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the verification unit to include the features of "mod_log_common" and considered the references to be analogous to one another based on the related fields of endeavor.

7. Claims 6, 20, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "HTML" and Anand as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of US Patent 5 826 034 A to Albal.

Regarding claim 6, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 5.

"HTML" and Anand do not disclose whereby said at least one action further comprises sending a facsimile to said e-mail address, however, Albal does disclose these limitations (column 2, lines 37-59; column 9, lines 8-28, specifically lines 21-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of these references since Albal discloses that the invention is able to enable a user to send any type of communication by any other type of communication through the use of converting the sent communication into the format of the communication to be received through the Internet (column 2, lines 43-57). In view of these specific advantages described above in Albal and wherein the references are directed towards sending data via a network such as the Internet, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of these references and would have considered the references to be analogous to one another based on their related fields of endeavor.

Regarding claim 20, "HTML" and Anand disclose the system of claim 5.

"HTML" and Anand do not disclose wherein said at least one action further includes providing a voice connection to said e-mail address, however, Albal does disclose these limitations (column 2, lines 37-59; column 9, lines 8-28, specifically lines 21-25).

Claim 20 is rejected since the motivations regarding the obviousness of claim 6 also apply to claim 20.

Claim 44 is also rejected since claim 44 recites a system that contains substantially the same limitations as recited in claim 6.

Conclusion

The prior art listed in the PTO-892 form included with this Office Action disclose methods, systems, and apparatus similar to those claimed and recited in the specification. The Examiner has cited these references to evidence the level and/or knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to provide support for universal facts and the technical reasoning for the rejections made in this Office Action including the Examiner's broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims as required by MPEP 2111 and to evidence the plain meaning of any terms not defined in the specification that are interpreted by the Examiner in accordance with MPEP 2111.01. The Applicant should consider these cited references when preparing a response to this Office Action.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action

is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George C. Neurauter, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9AM to 5:30PM Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/gcn/

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100